DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 455 039 RC 022 507

AUTHOR Fox, Sandra J.
TITLE Standards-Based Reform and American Indian/Alaska Native Education.
SPONS AGENCY Office of Elementary and Secondary Education (ED), Washington, DC. Indian Education Programs.
PUB DATE 2000-05-31
NOTE 17p.; Paper presented at the American Indian and Alaska Native Education Research Agenda Conference (Albuquerque, NM, May 30-June 1, 2000).
PUB TYPE Opinion Papers (120) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Academic Standards; Accountability; *American Indian Education; American Indians; Culturally Relevant Education; *Educational Change; *Educational Needs; Educational Practices; Elementary Secondary Education; Evaluation Methods; High Stakes Tests; *National Standards; Performance Based Assessment; Research Needs; Student Evaluation; Test Bias
IDENTIFIERS Bureau of Indian Affairs

ABSTRACT

The standards-based reform movement has the potential to improve American Indian education. The philosophy underlying the language arts standards that promotes the active use of authentic language and the teaching of skills in context, and the constructivist theory of learning reflected in the mathematics and science standards are both consistent with American Indian ways of teaching. Performance-based assessment and multiple measures can avoid the cultural bias found in standardized tests. The Bureau of Indian Affairs has developed complementary standards that infuse aspects of Indian culture into the national standards. The application of the new standards to special education students and the emphasis on inclusion should result in fewer Indian children being misplaced into special education programs. Some concerns around standards-based reform that Indian people must address include the need for improved instruction and assistance for students who need it to meet the standards and pass graduation exams; the need to assure that standards and assessments are appropriate for Indian students; the need for increased professional development and teacher preparation programs; and the need to demand that states and the Bureau of Indian Affairs assist schools that have low-performing students. American Indians must understand what standards-based reform means for their children, demand the good parts of it, and protect their children from abuse that might come from it. Implications and recommendations for future research are discussed. (Contains 45 references.) (TD)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

ED 455 039

Standards-Based Reform and American Indian/Alaska Native Education

Sandra J. Fox

Prepared for the American Indian/Alaska Native Research Agenda Conference, May 31, 2000 (Albuquerque, NM)

This commissioned paper was funded by the U.S. Department of Education, Office of Elementary and Secondary Education, Office of Indian Education, "specifically National Activities (IX-A-4) FY 2000"

RC022507

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

- ☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
- ☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
- • Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Standards-based Reform and American Indian/Alaska Native Education

by Sandra J. Fox D. Ed.

A major change taking place in American education is called "standards-based reform." It is impacting Indian schools and American Indian/Alaska Native students wherever they are in this country. The government is seeking agreement on what students are to know and be able to do (the content standards) and on how well students must learn this content (the performance standards). There will be new assessments to determine if the performance standards are met, and schools will be held accountable for student learning.

Standards delineate new, more challenging content affecting all K-12 levels. First, national content standards were developed for the various school subject areas, then, because of insistence upon local control, each state was allowed to develop its own standards and a new assessment system aligned with the standards to directly test the learning of the new content. The impetus for the standards movement was the recognition by governmental and business leaders that students were not being adequately prepared to perform in the work place and were not performing as well in school as students in other countries (Jennings, 1998). It is an economic issue.

Standards-based reform is meant to force schools to change to produce required results; however, change takes time, resources and massive effort. A 5-year Report Card on American Education, covering 1995-1999, indicated that 50 states now have new, challenging content standards. However, only 25 had performance standards in 1999 (U.S. Department of Education, 2000a). A survey done by Public Agenda (2000), which publishes an annual "Reality Check" report, indicates that "even though states have academic achievement (content) standards on the books, these guidelines so far have done little to change the way schools operate. Only 44 percent of teachers said standards have led them to expect more from students." The 5-Year Report Card also indicated that the percent of teachers who "feel very well prepared" to implement higher standards did not change significantly from 1996-1998, a time when a good deal of professional development on implementing content standards took place.

John (Jack) Jennings, in the conclusion to *Why National Standards and Tests? Politics and the Quest for Better Schools*, states, "setting clear standards and writing tests to measure their attainment is only the beginning point. Teachers must be retrained, textbooks must be improved, and students who do not do well must be assisted. Parents, too, must understand that greater emphasis must be placed on raising academic achievement." In addition to working hard to implement standards-based reform in their own schools and communities as a condition of federal funding, educators of Indian students must stay abreast of developments in the reform effort.

RC022507

Following are excerpts from Secretary Riley's (2000) annual state of American education address. They offer guidance on implementing standards and assessments and indicate the progress and direction of the reform movement.

1. **Have a healthy and ongoing dialogue with parents and teachers**. The ultimate success of this effort depends on our teachers and principals and it requires us to go the extra mile to make sure that parents understand and support their efforts. State leaders and educators need to listen to concerns.

2. **States must make sure that their standards are challenging and realistic**. There is power in having high expectations. But setting high expectations does not mean setting them so high that they are unreachable except for only a few.

3. **We have to create quality assessments that have a direct connection to the standards**. If all of our efforts get reduced to one test, we've gotten it all wrong. If we force our best teachers to teach only to the test, we will lose their creativity and even lose some of them from the classroom. All states should incorporate multiple ways of measuring learning-essays and extended responses, portfolios and performance assessments, as well as multiple choice tests. Every test should have as its ultimate purpose helping the child.

4. **Invest wisely to improve teaching and learning**. As states continue to implement standards, they must also invest in their teachers and students. Invest in sustained professional development. Expand summer school and after-school programs. High-stakes tests including high school exit exams are necessary. At the same time, you have to help students and teachers prepare for these tests-they need the preparation time and the resources to succeed, and the test must be on matters that they have been taught.

5. **Insist on real accountability for results**. We must not be deterred from insisting that our schools be held accountable for results-for making progress each year to reach challenging standards. We must act now and give schools the help they need. If a school is truly struggling we should not be afraid to reconstitute it or close it down and start over. There must be standards for promotion and graduation. But ending social promotion should not be a hurried response; it must be a well-conceived plan for achieving success. Students must have multiple opportunities to demonstrate competence, and educators should rely on more than one measure to make a final decision. We should not give up on students who still don't meet the promotion standards. We should be creating alternatives that provide them with intensive help.

Another statement in Riley's address was "a quality education for every child is a 'new civil right' for the 21st century."

The Secretary's speech indicates that standards-based reform is not taking place as was expected and required by 1994 Title I legislation. There is need for extensive, continuous professional development of teachers and discussion with teachers and parents regarding all aspects of standards-based reform. The use of multiple measures, including performance-based assessment, is not taking place easily. In some cases, standards are set too high for many students. There is an emphasis on accountability for results, revamping or closing schools that are not responding, and meeting standards for promotion and tests for graduation. There is also emphasis on helping schools and kids so that things won't get to the point that schools have to be closed or kids have to be retained. There are major ramifications for American Indian/Alaska Native education.

Content Standards and Indian Education

Theoretically, full implementation of the content standards should have a positive impact on Indian education. They are based upon the most recent research on teaching and learning. The language arts standards include reading and the other language skills, and the philosophy underlying them promotes the active use of authentic language and literature and the teaching of skills in context rather than in isolation. The language arts are seen as the keys to unlocking all other learning. This philosophy should force the development of high quality language arts programs for all students including limited English proficient students (Office of Educational Research and Improvement, 1997b). It is also consistent with what has long been recommended in the literature for improving the language arts skills of Indian students (Fox & LaFontaine, 1995).

Sharon Nelson Barber, Rappahannock, and Elise Trumbull Estrin (1995a) of the Far West Laboratory characterize the new math and science standards as:

> a move toward a potentially improved pedagogy for all students...The theory of learning reflected in the mathematics and science standards and associated reforms is "constructivist." They (students) "construct" knowledge based on what they already know, what they are motivated to learn about, and how new experience and information are presented to them...American Indian ways of teaching, such as modeling and providing for long periods of observation and practice by children, are quite harmonious with constructivist notions of learning.

The new content standards apply to <u>all</u> students including special education students. All students are to learn more challenging content, but the strategies and approaches utilized to teach it are local decisions (Office of Educational Research and Improvement). Special education students are also to be included in the regular classroom rather than in pullout situations, except in extreme cases (Individuals with Disabilities Education Act Amendments, 1997). This new emphasis, plus the use of performance-based assessment, should result in fewer children being placed in special education and fewer Indian children being misplaced in that program.

The Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA), often seen as the fifty-first state for purposes of funding from the Department of Education, was also required to develop content standards for its schools. Considering the complexity of the Bureau school system with schools in 23 different states and the importance of honoring tribal sovereignty and local control, a plan was devised which would give schools choice in the matter of standards (Office of Indian Education Programs, 1997). All BIA schools have had to adopt new content standards as a requirement of their Title I funding. First, the Bureau adopted the national standards as its official "state" standards. In addition, it developed a complementary set of standards that infused aspects of Indian culture into the national standards. Schools were then given the choice to:

1. adopt and follow the national standards,
2. adopt the state standards of the state in which they are located, or
3. develop their own standards as long as they are as stringent as the national or state standards.

Schools could also adopt the "Indian" standards to be used in conjunction or combined with the state or national standards. The Indian standards have also been made available to public schools and have been distributed at the National Indian Education Association annual conference. These standards can be made tribal specific. The development of content standards has provided the opportunity to fuse Indian content into the base curricula of schools, a longtime goal for Indian education.

There has been almost wholesale adoption of state standards by BIA-funded schools. For some, the requirements of state accreditation led to the adoption of state standards. A further motivator was that state standards would be the basis for the state assessment system in which the schools would be participating. Through Goals 2000 there was an emphasis on working more closely with neighboring public schools, and state standards would provide a common curriculum that could assist transfer students. Very few schools actually developed their own standards. Those that did found it a useful process, but in the end their standards also reflected the state content standards.

As in the rest of the nation, many Bureau-funded schools are only now working on implementing the content standards (Office of Indian Education Programs, 2000). Other Bureau-funded schools have submitted evidence of their alignment of curricula and standards to states, but this does not guarantee implementation. High staff turnover rates in BIA-funded schools complicate the adoption of standards. Thus, the implementation of standards in Bureau-funded schools varies from schools that may not even know they are to have standards to those with highly sophisticated, aligned systems with performance assessment that informs teaching and learning of the new content, e.g. Tiospa Zina Tribal School in South Dakota (Tiospa Zina Tribal School, 1997).

Input into the development of state standards was to take place with participation of Indian people, as with all people. North Dakota standards were developed with a great deal of input from tribal groups in that state (McRel,1999). Some states had begun the process of developing content "standards" even before it was required by Title I. Minnesota had incorporated a strategy called the Coordinated Model for Educational Improvement under which the state began to develop model learner outcomes for all subject areas (Erickson, 1987). A set of Indian learner outcomes was included (American Indian Education Committee, 1994), and when graduation standards were developed, Indian educators were invited to provide recommendations (Fond du Lac School, 1994).

Indian input ranged from that found in North Dakota and Minnesota to states in which Indian people probably didn't even realize such an effort was taking place or were not invited to participate. The requirement for standards for BIA-funded schools was met with some opposition from tribes who questioned its encroachment on their sovereignty. The Navajo Nation suggested the development of its own content standards for all of the schools that served Navajo students. While this could have worked, because there is an allowance for the development of local content standards as long as they are stringent as the state or national standards, it was not formally pursued. Most schools serving Navajo students now follow state content standards, sometimes as a condition of their state accreditation. Some states have also encouraged the development of local standards; others have not.

For the Bureau's Indian standards, input was gathered in working consultation sessions at the National Indian School Board Association and National Indian Education Association annual conferences. The Indian standards were developed, revised based upon consultations, and finalized by ORBIS Associates (1998), an Indian-owned education research and training firm of Washington, DC.

Indian involvement in the total standards process is vital. If Indian people are to support the standards-based reform effort, they must understand what it is and be watchdogs to ensure that content standards are realistic and appropriate for their children. They must guarantee that Indian content is included, if so desired. Indian educators should have been and must still be highly involved in the development of content and performance standards that will determine the learning and evaluation of the children they teach.

The new standards affect other programs. For example, the National Science Foundation's Rural Systemic Initiative (1999) is a standards-based reform effort, and the goals for Title IX programs are to be consistent with the new standards adopted by schools. The report, *Improving Education for Indian Students in the Context of Education Reform* (Policy Studies Associates, 1997), cited the need for professional development for Title IX and other staff on the incorporation and implementation of the new standards. Indian educator, Gwen Shunatona (1990), suggests that the performance-oriented concept can be applied by designing cultural education components that address higher-order thinking and serve as models for classroom teachers to use.

New Assessments and Indian Education

Title I of the Improving America's Schools Act requires each state to implement a new assessment system aligned with its new, more challenging content standards. Guidance is provided in *Assessment of Student Performance* (Office of Educational Research and Improvement, 1997b). These new assessment systems are to include the use of multiple measures (various means of assessing) and performance-based methods in contrast to reliance on one standardized, norm-referenced test. This should be helpful to Indian education and Indian children. Performance-based assessment is described as follows:

> In performance assessment, students construct, rather than select, responses. Students may write, give a speech, solve a problem, or do a project to show what they know. Teachers observe student behavior on those tasks and systematically record information about the student's learning gained from the observation. Teachers are able to see patterns in students' learning and thinking. This method of assessment is ongoing, built as a part of the instructional process. It also drives the instructional process. Students are well prepared for what is expected of them and understand criteria that will be used in assessment. Rubrics explain how tasks will be assessed by defining exemplary, competent, minimal or inadequate performance or other delineations such as advanced, proficient and partially proficient, as required by the U. S. Department of Education (Fox, 1999).

Performance-based assessment can more readily evaluate the learning and application of challenging content and higher order thinking skills than can standardized, multiple choice tests. A systematic gathering and evaluation of such performances can provide the basis for a reliable assessment system. Performance assessment provides information on what and how children are learning, thus informing and improving instruction. Assessment and instruction are combined, and both are improved. Whether utilized for high-stakes testing or only as formative classroom evaluation, performance-based assessment helps children, as Secretary Riley says tests should. Some educators (Black & Wiliam, 1998) argue that the use of performance assessment is the only way that instruction will be changed to teach and reach the high standards.

Performance-based assessment eliminates the lack of information that occurs if a student is absent on the day of testing. This assessment does not take place on one day as norm-referenced testing does. It is ongoing and many performances are considered before determinations are made about a student's achievement. At any given time, with examples of a student's work and other evidence, performance assessment can report whether a student is advanced, proficient or partially proficient in an academic area. It includes information on what students know and are able to do that can be provided by one school to the next to be helpful to teachers who receive transfer students.

The assessment of Indian students using standardized, multiple choice tests has been controversial because of cultural bias identified within them (Nichols, 1991), (Bordeaux, 1995), (Estrin & Nelson-Barber, 1995b). The act of testing, in general, has been questioned. Gloria Grant (2000) of the Chinle, AZ, Unified School District, has stated, "The Indian way is not to judge children's learning by telling them that they are right or wrong. Our way is to give validation because we base learning on values, a way of life – to give hope. Our Indian children have been beaten down by the system before they are given a chance to learn because of testing."

Performance-based assessment can assist in providing student evaluation that is free of cultural bias (FairTest, 1996). The performance tasks can be based upon experiences that are related to real life. This kind of assessment can take place in children's native languages and can include students' languages and cultures as strengths. Students and parents can be actively involved in assessing progress. Performance based assessment is also a more culturally acceptable way to evaluate the production of tasks (Bordeaux, 1995). It is utilized for powwow and sports activities and for Indian art and other contests. Performance assessment is a fair way to assess learning.

The Bureau of Indian Affairs selected the Learning Record performance-based system as its "state" assessment system to evaluate the learning of the national content standards, the official BIA "state" standards. A core development group has been trained and it is being used in a group of BIA schools. This system originated in inner city London for use with children from many different cultures and language backgrounds. It can be used with any content standards. Teachers are trained to become highly proficient at evaluating student achievement according to scales (performance standards delineating various levels of acquisition of content standards) and to gather evidence from multiple sources (measures) to prove placement. The Learning Record incorporates all of the characteristics of performance assessment and has a moderation activity for teachers to cross check other teachers' evidence of placement. This has provided for validity and reliability of the system (Barr, 1995). A comparison of the Learning Record's scale placements and a standardized, norm-referenced test found that summative scores provided by teachers using the Learning Record were at the very least equal in rigor to those of the norm-referenced test (Center for Language in Learning, 1999).

A major outcome of implementation of the Learning Record has been increased use of research-based teaching strategies by the core development group as measured by a Learning Record-developed instrument. Other changes reported are more positive student attitudes toward their ability to learn and increased parent interest and involvement (Fox, 1999). Bureau-funded schools, however, will not be utilizing the Learning Record as their high-stakes assessment system because their choice to utilize state content standards requires them to use state assessments. Hopefully, the Learning Record will be promoted and utilized, though, as an additional multiple measure that can be coupled with state assessment systems to provide for more accurate assessment and improved instruction of Indian children in Bureau-funded schools.

Even performance-based assessments must be reviewed, however, to determine their appropriateness. They, too, may include material that makes them culturally biased for Indian students. Consider the state performance assessment that included a picture of an owl which is a sign of foreboding to many tribes. Educators of Indian students should be reviewing all new state tests to determine if there is bias that can be eliminated now.

A further factor that must be considered when assessing Indian children was revealed in a recent report of the Department of Education (1999) entitled *Start Early, Finish Strong* that indicated that children from high poverty areas are coming to school with vocabularies of approximately 3,000 words compared to their counterparts from affluent homes who come with 20,000 word vocabularies. Children who know and use 20,000 words have a much easier time learning to read and write than do children who know and use only 3,000 words. Further, if students don't know the words on standardized achievement tests, there is a huge, automatic penalty. *What Works in Teaching and Learning* reported that problems with math are linked to language as well (Fox, 1999).

While this tells us that schools must address the issue of language development, is it fair to compare these two groups of children and the schools from which they come? Is it fair to retain a student when his lack of achievement is due to his lack of vocabulary? *Start Early, Finish Strong* goes on to say that "to provide the low-income child with weekly language experience equal to that of a child from a middle-income family, it would require 41 hours per week of out-of-home word exposure as rich as those heard by the most affluent children." Television watching doesn't help as the vocabulary of the average children's book is greater than that found on prime-time. Perhaps the reason that the achievement of many Indian students appears to drop off at the fourth grade is because they have only a fourth grade level vocabulary.

Title I requires that assessment meet the needs of limited English speaking students. Many Indian children are limited English speakers, even when they do not speak their native languages. In fact, there is an Indian English (Pewewardy, 1998a). A U.S. Department of Education report (Olson, 1997) acknowledges that proficiency in the English language is a factor that affects students' performance on tests and provides guidance on making accommodations for limited English proficient students when testing them. Providing accommodations and performance-based assessment must be absolute requirements for evaluating limited English proficient Indian students.

The need for performance-based assessment and multiple measures to help level the playing field is very, very important. According to a state of the states report published by Education Week (Jerald, 2000), however, states are progressing slowly in their development of performance assessments. Only Kentucky and Vermont have portfolio assessments. Forty-two states have extended response assessments in English/language arts, but only nine have extended response assessments for subject areas other than English. All states are continuing the use of multiple-choice tests. The need to ensure that all tests test what is taught and that they are free of cultural bias is also critical.

Accountability and Indian Education

As part of the reform effort, each state, including the Bureau of Indian Affairs, has to have a plan for holding all schools accountable for student performance on the new assessments. The plan must include whether or not there will be a test that students must pass to graduate, if there will be school report cards, if schools will receive grades or ratings, if the state will provide rewards to schools that achieve performance goals, how the state will provide assistance to schools that need it, and how the state will impose sanctions if schools do not meet goals. Each plan must be based upon the state's standards and assessment system. According to progress in this area so far, the state of the states report in *Education Week* (Jerald, 2000) indicates that New Mexico, Maryland, New York, North Carolina, Oregon, Massachusetts, Virginia, Florida, Oklahoma, Kansas and Nevada received an A for their accountability plans. North Dakota, Hawaii, Tennessee, and Montana received a D, and Iowa received an F. Arizona received a B, South Dakota a C.

Lawsuits are already arising because of standards-based reform and new accountability systems. The Mexican-American Legal Defense and Education Fund (MALDEF) provided the first major legal challenge to state graduation tests. The MALDEF was attempting to prove that requiring students to pass the Texas Assessment of Academic Skills in order to obtain a diploma discriminates against Latino and African-American youth. A federal judge upheld the Texas high school exit exam even though he found it does adversely affect minority students. A lawsuit by parents in Arizona and a protest in Wisconsin have also been fueled by high-stakes tests (FairTest, 1999). Are Indian educators and others prepared to address such issues on behalf of Indian students?

Can parents sue a school for not providing the quality of education needed? In Colorado, an appeals court ruled that parents cannot sue a school because they have not individually entered into a contract with the school and have not individually paid for services (Education USA, 2000). On the more positive side, the Office of Civil Rights in the Department of Education is now issuing a document entitled, *The Use of Tests When Making High-Stakes Decisions for Students*. It states that "it is improper – and potentially illegal – to use a test score as a single factor to determine retention, graduation, or college admission" (FairTest, 2000).

The standards-based reform effort can help to improve Indian education with new standards and assessment; however, as has happened in the past, the game of blaming the victim may occur. In order for this reform to really work for Indian students, schools must see themselves as accountable for providing the educational program and support necessary for Indian children to meet the standards. States, including the Bureau of Indian Affairs, must see themselves as accountable for providing the technical assistance, training and support that schools need for them to improve instruction and provide the educational program that students must have to meet the standards.

There are skeptics and critics of standards-based reform. For example, Alfie Kohn (1999) argues that it will lead to schools spending their time in test preparation so that students can perform on the same old multiple choice type tests and creative teaching and learning will be eliminated. Harold Howe II (2000), citing the failure of the Chicago grade retention program and the concern about testing in Texas in the *American School Board Journal*, states that rigorous standards and high-stakes tests are not the answer for children in poverty. Social factors must be taken into account. In regard to reform and Indian children, Indian educator Cornel Pewewardy (1998b) in "Our Children Can't Wait," suggests:

> All of the restructuring in the world will be of no benefit to children if the philosophy, theory, assumptions, and definitions are flawed or invalid. Indigenous educators and parents know the problems and their causes. With our limited time and money we must now talk about solutions and their implementation into future 'indigenous' schools.

There are four major factors that, if addressed, would improve the education of American Indian/Alaska Native students (Indian Nations At Risk Task Force, 1991), (Cummins, 1992). They are: 1. incorporation of language and culture, 2. provision of community and parental involvement, 3. instruction that is appropriate for Indian students, and 4. testing that is appropriate for Indian students. It appears that standards-based reform has the potential to improve instruction and testing for Indian children, but the incorporation of native language and culture and the provision of community and parental involvement must be addressed as well.

Under the U.S. Department of Education's plan for school reform, some schools are being allowed and encouraged to adopt school reform models to help them along (2000b). This is under the Comprehensive School Reform Demonstration Program. Some of the models are Success for All and Effective Schools. Perhaps there should be an Indian education or indigenous education model(s) developed. Some of the pieces may already be in place. Alaska has adopted process or opportunity to learn type standards for culturally responsive schools and standards for teaching as part of their reform effort (Assembly of Alaska Native Educators, 1998). The Bureau of Indian Affairs' Indian content standards that complement regular content standards can assist Indian students in learning the more difficult content by relating it to their own real worlds. Now may be the time to hold schools, states and the nation accountable for providing Indian students an educational program that truly meets their unique needs.

Schools must change in order to teach more difficult content. A great deal of professional development and reformed teacher preparation programs are required to provide teachers of Indian students with the skills necessary to meet the new standards. Social problems that affect student learning must also be addressed. Like students, however, schools should be evaluated on gains made and with multiple measures rather than only by comparison with other schools.

Need for Research and Study

All aspects of school reform must be carefully examined by Indian educators. Further ramifications for Indian education, such as teacher testing or including Indian students in national testing must be carefully studied. Questions arise as the reform effort progresses. Should BIA-funded schools participate in state graduation exams? Is it too late for Indian input into state standards and assessment systems? Indian educators must seek answers to these and other questions and concerns.

The progress of standards-based reform for American Indian and Alaska Native children will have to be watched closely. There are many possibilities for research with this reform movement. Following are some possible research topics:

> Are Indian students receiving standards-based instruction?
>
> Were content and performance standards developed with the input of Indian people?
>
> Are Indian students being assessed with multiple measures?
>
> Are Indian students with limited English proficiency being provided accommodations?
>
> Were assessment systems reviewed and approved by Indian educators?
>
> Has Indian student achievement increased as a result of standards-based instruction?
>
> Are there any Indian schools where significant gains are being made? Why?
>
> How well do Indian students perform on performance-based assessments versus multiple-choice tests?
>
> Has the dropout rate for Indian students decreased or increased as a result of graduation exams?
>
> What is the status of Indian schools, including BIA-funded schools, with regard to sanctions placed as a result of lack of progress in student achievement?

Research will provide focus on school reform in Indian education and help to gather evidence as to its effectiveness and value. Educators of Indian students will also have to utilize research regarding improving educational achievement, especially for Indian children, in order to provide the program to ensure that their students meet these new higher standards.

Conclusion

There are many concerns around standards-based reform that Indian people have to address. The need to require improved instruction and assistance for students who need it to meet the standards and pass the graduation exams is paramount. The need to be sure that standards and assessments to be appropriate for Indian students is utmost. The need to demand that states, including the Bureau of Indian Affairs, assist schools that have low-performing students is vital.

There is great need for dialogue with Indian educators, school boards, and Indian parents so that they fully understand what standards-based reform means for Indian children. Indian people must understand what it is and be ready to respond to it, participate in it, demand the good parts of it, and protect their children from abuse that might come from it. In Virginia, parents are organizing against the new standards (Kohn, 1999, October 10). In Washington state, they are lining up to buy books that they can use to help their children pass the tests (Neble, 1999).

While there are cautions surrounding the movement, standards-based reform might provide the catalyst that is needed to improve Indian education and do what we know needs to be done to better educate American Indian and Alaska Native students. American Indian/Alaska Native people want their children to receive the highest quality education and should demand it as a "new civil right of the 21st century."

Prepared for the American Indian/Alaska Native
Research Agenda Conference, May 31, 2000,
Albuquerque, NM

References

American Indian Education Committee. (1994). *American Indian curriculum frameworks*. St. Paul, MN: Minnesota State Board of Education.

Assembly of Alaska Native Educators. (1998). *Alaska standards for culturally-responsive schools*. Anchorage: Alaska Native Knowledge Network.

Barr, M .A. & Syverson, M.A. (1999). *Assessing literacy with the Learning Record: A handbook for teachers, grades 6-12*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Black, P. & Wiliam, D. (1998). Inside the black box: Raising standards through classroom assessment. *Phi Delta Kappan*, Oct.

Bordeaux, R. (1995). *Assessment for American Indian and Alaska Native learners*. Charleston, WV: Clearinghouse on Rural Education and Small Schools.

Center for Language in Learning. (1999). *Learning record correlation study*. El Cajon, CA: Author.

Cummins, J. (1992). The empowerment of Indian students. In J. Reyhner (Ed.), *Teaching American Indian Students*. Norman: University of Oklahoma.

Erickson, W. (1987). The coordinated model for educational improvement. *Counterpoint* (5), 1-6.

Estrin, E. T. & Nelson-Barber, S. (1995a). Bringing Native American perspectives to mathematics and science teaching. *Theory Into Practice, 34* (3),174-185.

Estrin, E. T. & Nelson-Barber, S. (1995b). *Issues in cross-cultural assessment: American Indian and Alaska Native students*. San Francisco: Far West Laboratory.

FairTest. (1996). *Implementing performance assessments: A guide to classroom, school and system reform*. Cambridge, MA: National Center for Fair and Open Testing.

FairTest. (1999). *FairTest Examiner, 13* (4), 1-8.

FairTest. (2000). U. S. Ed. Dept. Reasserts Test-Misuse Warning. *FairTest Examiner, 14* (1), 1, 14.

Fond du Lac School. (1994, December 2). *Correspondence to Minnesota State Department regarding input into graduation standards*. Unpublished document.

Fox, J. (1999, March 10). Math problems often linked to language. *What Works in Teaching and Learning*, pp. 1-2.

Fox, S. (1999). Student assessment in Indian education or what is a roach? In K.G. Swisher and J.W. Tippeconnic III (Eds.), *Next Steps: Research and Practice to Advance Indian Education.* Charleston, WV: Clearinghouse on Rural Education and Small Schools.

Fox, S. & LaFontaine, V. (1995). A whole language approach to the communication skills. In H.Gilliland (Ed.), *Teaching the Native American.* Dubuque, IA: Kendall/Hunt Publishing.

Grant, G. (2000, April). Remarks presented at multi-cultural science conference, Rapid City, SD.

Harrison, D. (2000, February 21). Colo.: Parents can't sue over education quality. *Education* Week, p.5.

Howe, H. II (2000). High-stakes trouble. *American School Board Journal, 87* (5), 58-59.

Indian Nations At Risk Task Force. (1991). *Indian Nations at risk: An educational strategy for action.* Washington, DC: U. S. Department of Education.

Individuals with Disabilities Act Amendments, 34 CFR, Part 300. (1997).

Jennings, J. F. (1998). *Why national standards and tests? Politics and the quest for better schools.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Jerald, C. D. (2000, January 13). The state of the states. *Education Week,* pp. 62-65.

Kohn, A. (1999, October 10). A look at getting back to basics. First lesson: Unlearn what we've learned. *Washington Post,* p. B3.

Mid-Continental Regional Education Laboratory (McRrel). (1999). *Review of North Dakota social studies standards and benchmarks.* Unpublished document.

National Science Foundation. (1999). *Rural systemic initiatives in science, mathematics and technology education.* Washington, DC: Author.

Neble, Stacey. (1999). *Practice makes perfect: Preparing your child for the 4th grade WASL Test.* Kenmore, WA: Author.

Nichols, R. (1991). *Continuous evaluation of Native education programs of American Indian and Alaska Native students.* Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, Indian Nations at Risk Task Force.

Office of Educational Research and Improvement. (1997a). *Assessment of student performance.* Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education.

Office of Educational Research and Improvement. (1997b). *School reform and student diversity*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education.

Office of Indian Education Programs. (1997). *Goals 2000/IASA bulletin no. 1*. Washington, DC: Bureau of Indian Affairs.

Office of Indian Education Programs. (2000). *Goals 2000 reports*. School Report Cards. Albuquerque, NM: Bureau of Indian Affairs.

Olson, J. F. (1997). *The inclusion of students with disabilities and limited English proficient students in large-scale assessments: A summary of recent progress*. Washington, DC: National Center for Education Statistics.

ORBIS Associates. (1998). *American Indian content standards*. Washington, DC: Bureau of Indian Affairs.

Pewewardy, C. (1998a). Fluff and feathers: Treatment of American Indians in the literature and the classroom. *Equity & Excellence in Education, 31*(1), 69-76.

Pewewardy, C. (1998b). Our children can't wait: Recapturing the essence of indigenous schools in the United States. *Cultural Survival Quarterly, 22* (1), 29-34.

Policy Studies Associates. (1997). *Improving education for Indian students in the context of education reform*. Washington, DC: U. S. Department of Education.

Public Agenda. (2000). *Reality check 2000*. New York: Author.

Riley, R. (2000, February 22). *Seventh annual state of American education address*. Southern High School, Durham, North Carolina.

Shunatona, G. (1990). *A review of school transformation: Change for the 21st century*. Washington, DC: ORBIS Associates.

Tiospa Zina Tribal School. (1997). *Standards, benchmarks and assessment system*. Unpublished document.

U.S. Department of Education. (1999). *Start early, finish strong: How to help every child become a reader*. Washington, DC: Author

U. S. Department of Education. (2000a). *A five-year report card on American education*. Washington, DC: Author.

U.S. Department of Education. (2000b). *National evaluation of the comprehensive school reform demonstration program*. Washington, DC: Author.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE